**Missoula County Public Schools**

**Title I Standing Committee**

Wednesday, April 24, 2014

6:00 to 7:30 PM

Business Building, 915 South Avenue, Board Room

**Committee Members:**

**Guiding Question:**

How do we assure the MCPS Title I program best meets the needs of students and families?

**Long term target:**

Align Title I goals, programming and budgets to the Federal requirements, MCPS district, Graduation Matters and 21st Century Model of Education goals.

**Short term targets:**

* Review, discuss and reflect on the most accurate measurement of poverty in MCPS high schools.

**Present:** Heather Davis Schmidt, Brian Fortmann, Julie Robitaille, Brian Bessette, David Rott, Matt Quinlan, Tracy Ledyard, Terry Jarvis, Lori Grant, Karen Allen, Trevor Laboski, Diane Anderson, Lisa Hendrix, DeeAnn Mooney, Janet Hegedus, Kat Pecora, Katrina Stout, Dee Schmitz, Mary Stone, Abby Green, Marti Leibenguth, Tim McHugh, Seena Demmons

**MINUTES**

**Welcome, review agenda; review collective commitments for collaborative work**

Heather opened the meeting at 6:08 p.m. She hopes everyone read the article in the newspaper regarding this committee; it is something we struggled with last year and we knew it would be a struggle this year. Introductions were made.

Heather gave a reminder of a few things: the advisory committee is about getting together with a variety of stakeholders and addressing how we provide services and our budgets, and addressing needs on a district-wide level. We started this committee last year and continued this year. Our guiding question: How do we assure the MCPS Title I program best meets the needs of students and families? Our long term target is to align Title I goals, programming and budgets to the federal requirements, MCPS district, Graduation Matters and 21st Century Model of Education goals. Our short term targets for tonight are to review, discuss and reflect on the most accurate measurement of poverty in MCPS high schools.

Heather reviewed the agenda for tonight’s meeting. There was a question about the written reflection—is that like the “hot or not”? Heather: different questions, more specific. We will present the question and all the responses, and move that forward as part of the process. This is more specific than the “hot or not.” Heather reviewed the collective commitments. First, we start and end on time; we started late but we will end on time. Second, we will respect all viewpoints, focus on students and learning, and focus on the task at hand, the agenda. We will work at strengthening what we do well and make suggestions for improvement; stay positive. Heather appreciates that so far in all our work we have been very professional and remained focused on the topic. We want to avoid a school vs. school conversation. It is a conversation about how we measure poverty most accurately in MCPS. Unfortunately the Title I guidelines don’t allow us to make decisions with our funding that we might like to make. How do we most accurately measure poverty in MCPS, most particularly in our high schools? Heather asked if there were changes or additions to the collective commitments; there were none.

**Presentation on Measuring Poverty**:

**Feeder School Pattern** – Matt Quinlan and Team

Matt: since he created the PowerPoint, updated data has been received; he had used data from 2013 for the presentation. The numbers may be different, but the basic philosophy will be same. District goals: 1-achievement and graduation for all students regardless of their circumstances or abilities; 2-restructure the organization to become more efficient, effective and accountable to support the goals of the district. The %-Free and Reduced method is recognized as inaccurate. Statement from the Department of Education: we know from experience that high school students are less likely to participate in free and reduced lunch programs than elementary students, for a variety of reasons, including easy access to food and privacy reasons. Independent policy research organizations agree—statement from the Alliance for Excellent Education: it is well recognized that free and reduced price lunch provides an inaccurate and low count at the high school level.

Matt explained that there are options: the Department of Education states that schools often may not be identified as eligible for Title I services or if eligible may not receive as high an allocation as their actual poverty rate would require. Matt noted that we see that happening in our district. Regarding the use of free and reduced forms in the high school over the last several years, Matt said that the calculations are inaccurate. Inaccurate data does not become accurate just because we track it for 5 years.

Open enrollment has an effect on the Free and Reduced percentage at schools. Hellgate retains 81% of its in-area students, the highest percentage of the city high schools. As the feeder pattern points out, 50% of those students are low income. Hellgate receives 38% of our population from out of area students, the most of the 3 city schools. This is significant because the programming that causes that population to choose to come to Hellgate includes IB, AP, the music program, etc. This increases our enrollment and lowers our F&R percentage. Typically, students who attend an out of area school do not qualify for free and reduced lunch; it is a different demographic, partly due to access to transportation. We can’t serve these students at the expense of low income students who live in our area—the 53.7% of students who live in our area who can’t afford transportation to other schools.

Next screen: the use of the %F&R method will result in a complete loss of Title I funding at HHS. Well over 400 students in poverty at Hellgate HS will not have access to vital graduation support. Math, reading, writing, and credit recovery classes will be cut. Materials and technology including iPads, an entire library of age-appropriate books for struggling readers, and numerous instructional resources will be packed up and sent away from Hellgate. Supplemental educational resources including free tutoring from Sylvan will no longer be avail to Hellgate HS students living in poverty. Summer school through Title I would no longer be available to Hellgate HS students. 55 credits were made up last year by Hellgate HS students. The Title I designation at Hellgate is used as supporting documentation to justify services for HHS from Upward Bound, a summer college readiness program designed for low income students who would be the first in their families to have the opportunity to attend college. Upward Bound uses documentation that HHS is a Title I school to justify serving our students. Servicing that program at HHS may be in jeopardy.

How can we solve 1-the documented inaccuracies of collecting F&R forms; 2-the problems of open enrollment affecting %-F&R; and 3-the removal of vital graduation support from low income students?

The feeder pattern: the Department of Education states that in order to address the situation of inadequate funding, an LEA (Local Educational Agency), i.e. the school board, may use the feeder pattern concept. The Alliance for Excellent Education states that the feeder pattern projection is more likely to provide a more accurate measure of poverty than %-F&R. They recommended requiring districts to use feeder pattern projections. MCPS, Helena and Great Falls used the feeder pattern last year to determine Title I funding. The number of students served is the heart of the matter. How many have access to vital graduation support: using %-F&R it is 500 students. Using the feeder pattern, 900 students would have access to graduation support classes, supplemental materials, summer school, etc. How can we best serve the greatest amount of students in our district? These numbers suggest without a question the best way is to fund 3 of our 4 high schools and 900 of our students by using the feeder pattern.

Next Matt showed a graph, which showed %-F&R vs. feeder pattern using March 2013 numbers. The numbers will change due to the new data, but it is accurate roughly within 3-4 percentage points. The discrepancy between F&R at Sentinel, Seeley-Swan, and Big Sky is about the same (about 5%). But at Hellgate HS that discrepancy is about 15%. Why? It is because fewer students turn in F&R forms at Hellgate and because of the effect of open enrollment. The feeder pattern is the most accurate measure of poverty our district could use. We have a choice to determine how many students and how many schools we would like to serve.

Tracy Ledyard added that we used the feeder pattern last year. In her conversation with OPI, B.J. Granbery said they assumed we would be using it again this year because it qualified the most of our schools. That is why we opted, in her recollection, for K-8 and high school budgets, was so that we could qualify more. Unfortunately and to her great disappointment this has become a situation in which we have school pitted against school, colleague against colleague, friend against friend. She hopes in the future we could try to avoid doing that by having a process that is much more collaborative. When we have stakeholders at the table, we are all so good at advocating for our students who have no voice. She respects all those at the table and the work they do. She hopes we can keep students as the focus of the conversation and recognize that we would love for every student at all our high schools to get as much service as possible. We need to really help these kids. Heather thanked both of them.

Clarification question: David Rott asked if the 900/500 is Hellgate HS. No, it is all the students. 900 is the number of students at Big Sky HS, Hellgate HS, Seeley-Swan, combined, that turned in written F&R applications that we know of. 500 is the number of students at Big Sky and Seeley, the 2 schools combined. If we use %-F&R to determine poverty, we will only serve those 2 schools. Heather: the number of students served does not equal the number of students in poverty. Once we determine the school being in poverty, it does not matter whether the kids are low income. Brian: those numbers do not number the students being served; they measure the free and reduced forms. Correct. Tracy: Big Sky has 40 more students that turned in forms than Hellgate HS, in our February numbers.

**F&R Meals Applications** – Janet Hegedus and Team

Janet: go back in time to the beginning of Title I, an older program, which has been around longer than she has been in the district. Her understanding is that it came about in response to many, many schools in our country that had very, very high poverty levels. Students in those schools had very deficient scores. Researchers saw a correlation between poverty and academic scores, which relates to the fact that those students do not have enrichment opportunities. The F&R formula came about as a measure of disadvantagement, to recognize which schools had the most need and poverty, and to provide enrichment. They were thinking of urban schools, many of which had poverty rates in the 90-95-98 percent range. With this formula, they would add up the district enrollment, determine the percentage of poverty in the district based on F&R forms, and determine which schools exceed the district average of poverty. For the past years since 1978 except for last year, we in MCPS have used F&R forms. Sentinel was not included, tragically, as the percentage of forms there was lower. The most needy schools receive funding. We chose to use that for many, many years, and for many, many years Hellgate HS, Big Sky HS and Seeley remained eligible, and people in the Sentinel district asked why they were not also being served. The F&R formula does have hard data. The students we have who have filled out the forms are truly in poverty. The feeder school pattern is truly a pattern, a forecast, a projection, because we do not know where those students will actually go. We have a lot of fluidity with open enrollment. Because of open enrollment, it makes the numbers less reliable than the hard data of the F&R forms. We have our share of many families who do not fill out the F&R for various reasons. It could be pride. They have talked about it. Terry and the counselors have heard that in conversations. She is not sure that we can say more students at Hellgate HS do not fill out forms than don’t fill them out at Sentinel or at Big Sky HS. We are looking at hard data to determine disadvantagement, and the number of F&R lunch forms seems to be the hardest data. It is really unfortunate that with the F&R formula that Hellgate HS does not fall below the district average—for the first time ever since she has been in the district. The percentage is only about 5% less than Sentinel. Big Sky HS almost equals Seeley. It is a surprise; it may be a changing demographic. She sees a lot of poverty, and there is a lot of poverty that is undetected. A student might look like a regular middle class student, but we have a lot of abject poverty, and we are attempting to meet their needs. She feels there is a question, and she hopes the committee considers it really seriously—what is the intent? How do we serve more students? How do we make the biggest impact? Is it putting more dollars into a stronger program?—or is it dispersing funds to reach more students? There are two sides to that coin, and she is conflicted herself. She is presenting the counter argument, because F&R is hard data. Maybe the community is changing. Janet said she would defer to her colleagues if they would like to add to that, or take questions. There were none.

Janet: also keep in mind as a committee that with the advent of Common Core, the bar has been raised. When we talked about skill gaps a few years ago, the skill gaps are huge. The students entering the schools will be at a disadvantage until we can muster resources to serve them well. All of our schools will require really good interventions to help students at the skill levels so they have opportunities post-high school.

**Clarifying Questions and Comments** – Moderated by Heather Davis Schmidt

Trevor said he wanted to clarify and add to this: We all serve F&R students. If you are in a school that does not receive Title money, but has a percentage of F&R kids, those kids are being served. As a collective group of people who care about this population, we need to start speaking about how we all serve those kids, not the mindset that those are someone else’s kids. He would encourage us to talk about the way we speak about serving those kids.

Janet: and we all serve skill-deficient kids. We have things in place. But she is suggesting we will need more services in place for a while if we are going to be raising the bar.

Abby Green, math teacher: With the requirement for all to do Algebra I right now, we have a huge number of students struggling. Now the district is requiring 3 years of math—it is a huge jump we are asking our kids to make. Some can barely get to school; some are not eating during the day. It is a difficult decision you need to make. We need to help those kids.

**Advisory Committee discussion** – Moderated by Heather Davis Schmidt

Heather: this part is less formal—any questions or comments?

David Rott: this is an advisory committee, not a policy committee. This is more of a conversational piece.

Tracy: as someone who has followed the process, this discussion tends to be brought forward to the cabinet and the practitioners as “the advisory committee feels.” So even though we don’t make a recommendation, sometimes she struggles with what comes forward out of this. We have the same thing about the Title I practitioners: that is a presentation on the services of people who are doing great things with Title I money and how we are going to use it.

Heather: this year it wasn’t because we moved forward with the belief that we had all come to an agreement about that. This year we thought we had that decision, until we got to the cabinet level and found that there were members from Hellgate who felt that we were no longer in agreement. Tracy: we were told Hellgate could not be funded, and we had no data. Heather: we had agreed last year throughout the process that F&R applications was the most accurate method, but once we got to the cabinet level it became clear that it was not all in agreement.

Julie Robitaille: question on the lavender sheet: for Big Sky, is this last year’s 8th graders? No, this is current K-8 who live in the geocode for the schools listed: so for Big Sky you have 7 from Paxson that are F&R and 9 total enrollment. The reality is that there are 7 students who attend Paxson who live in the Big Sky geocode, and who are choosing to attend Paxson while currently K-8 graders. That is where this is a pattern of projection: we are looking at current K-8th graders for the purple sheet. In conversations with OPI over the past few weeks about the accuracy of measurements, the feeder pattern, and how to account for the open enrollment issue, she learned something interesting about Seeley: the number is much higher than before. Sunset and Swan Valley do not have lunch programs, so we cannot use F&R application data; instead, we have to use U.S. Census data, and only B.J. Granbery has that access. That is true for Woodman school also. It raised the district average and even Sentinel’s number to be at the 40% level. Heather has had conversations with B.J. over the past 2 weeks and just got a response from her late Monday: essentially she said we do have some challenges using the feeder pattern method because of the open enrollment. She suggested we take a look at not only the current feeder pattern data but also look at our current high school students this year, based on what middle school they went to. For example, if a student went to Bonner for middle school, we determine what high school they chose to go to and whether they are F&R lunch. The challenge we have with that is our data system, Q, houses this data in different parts of Q so there is no way to pull the data easily. We are working on building a report. Currently we can only get that information separately and not align it. For her personally that would help resolve the issue of open enrollment, looking at where students are choosing to go. Seeley is relatively easy, but it does have students who go to urban schools.

Lisa Hendrix: with that line of thinking, she wanted to see if there was a different way to look at the data that would make more sense with open enrollment. She took her current enrollment and divided by which elementary they attended. She looked at how many current Hellgate HS students she has that attended Lowell or Lolo or each of the other schools. If she has 100 students attending Hellgate who live in Lowell area, and last year Lowell’s F&R rate was 80%, then she calculated that would be 80 students. She wanted to see what that number looked like, and found it to be about 490 students, which is 40% of her population. It falls right in the middle of these two other patterns. It is the reason she feels that the F&R method of deciding how much poverty there is, is a failed system. It underrepresents truly the percentage of poverty in the building. Heather does not think anyone would disagree with that. Karen agreed it would be true anywhere.

Trevor: we stuck with F&R applications. Even when Hellgate was going up and Big Sky was getting less money, that was okay with everyone. But now that it is reduced, we have a problem with that. Trevor said he will be a team player. As the person who signs all the out of district forms, he looks at why they are leaving. He could track if they are F&R, but he does not think we can go to the feeder pattern without tracking if those kids were on F&R in K-8. He does not think it is ethical to say to schools showing an increase of enrollment that we are giving them a decrease of funds. He has become a student of this. He said everyone needs to read the 30 page document. Matt quotes: it should not involve substantial administrative burdens. It says that knowing whether or not the kids were K-8 F&R is important if you are going to move to this method. If the district already surveys students…. We don’t have that data. Nevertheless the feeder pattern policy is rarely implemented—only 4% of LEAs use it. His interpretation is that this is for LEAs. We are predominantly talking about districts with one single high school that does not receive Title I. Trevor tracked down Mr. Wayne Riddle, an independent nonpartisan policy analyst who writes this stuff. Trevor contacted him, explained the situation and data. He did not expect him to respond. He explained that we are open enrollment and what his understanding of Riddle’s analysis was. Riddle’s response: he wants everyone to know that he doesn’t know everything here and does not want to get involved. But his analysis about feeder patterns was focused on situations where the LEAs decide not to conduct Title I programs in the high schools at all. It was about schools that don’t take advantage because they don’t get enough applications and don’t get above 35%. Feeder patterns are not as much a way to disburse the funds once you get them into the district. A switch to use feeder patterns would seem to be a way to shift limited funds among the high schools. If we take the stance that we want to serve the highest number of kids and not the percentage, he is okay only if we can show that the kids were there and that the feeder pattern represents reality. Riddle said he sees feeder patterns as away to induce LEAs to include high schools in their Title I services. He encourages people to really study that document. It is not a competition between schools, but when you see a population rapidly move up—we have 50%, one out of 2 kids in the classroom—to take money away from them, we need to be able to justify it with real data, not with projections.

Kat Pecora said she has read the document. What she got was that the purpose of Title I is to improve the academic achievement of disadvantaged students to ensure that all students have a fair and equal opportunity. At Seeley we use those funds for math enhancement, for Read 180, and to pay college tuition for dual enrollment students. We don’t have a university next door. It is the only way to start college on a level field. It is important to us that we do not have this huge reduction. We have a reduction this year of $18,000. We were told early in the year that the difference would be covered by the district, but now we are told that we will have to make it up in our own budget. That is the situation we will be put in in the future—our Title funds will not begin to cover our reading or math enhancement, let alone serve our advanced students.

Dee, a Seeley parent/taxpayer said she was enraged when she heard this. She does not think any of the kids should go without. She owns a small business, and she serves 80% of Seeley Lake. She knows the people who will not apply for F&R. She said that because she owns a business, she can’t apply for it. She knows that her kids go in early, and teachers will work with them before and after school. It enrages her that one school will take more while others take less. She said the feeder school method seems unfair because kids will not come from Missoula to Seeley. She is appalled at this.

Brian Bessette asked for more explanation about the system where you might be able to pull in information from Q. Response: We all agree the F&R is not as accurate as it could be, and that it declines at middle school and again at high school. It is obvious that it is not an accurate presentation. The feeder pattern method is not maybe accurate, but there are questions. Is it too late to do this with Q? Heather: No. The grant is not due until the end of September. We start the process early for staffing reasons in particular. Hellgate, Seeley and Big Sky have all had to put staffing decisions on hold while we are in this process. She is trying to move it along as quickly as possible; she is hopeful we can get it in the next week to 10 days.

Heather asked if everyone else feels this would help alleviate the issue. Fortmann said he wanted clarification on the number of students being served vs. the number of students on F&R. Heather replied that it doesn’t matter for the purposes of this discussion, because Title I allocations have to be based on poverty. Schoolwide, every student is considered a Title I student.

Julie Robitaille said she knows we are not a policy group, but she would like to stop going back and forth every year to make sure it works—she would like to find a system that gives us an accurate representation. She wonders if we could use the feeder pattern in middle school—it would help us a lot.

Tracy Ledyard: Helena and Great Falls use the feeder pattern for middle school and high school.

Heather: we have a lot less of open enrollment going on at middle school than we do at high school, but there is still some. Once we get the report built to give us the data and see how it works for high school, it would be easy to add middle school.

Julie Robitaille: was that number accurate, that there were only 40 more students who turned in a form at Big Sky? Yes, but Big Sky has 300 fewer students. It is based on percentages. Chief Charlo has about 420 students, and you have 46%, nearly half your students, on F&R, compared to Lowell, which has 280 students and 80% on F&R. The number of students on F&R is actually fairly equal. But it is based on percentage.

Tracy asked if the district wants to still offer open enrollment, or do they want the high schools to start closing their doors to protect F&R.

Trevor: when you are a failing school, you have to have school choice. But we are all failing schools, 100% statewide. Trevor: Sentinel then Big Sky then Hellgate is the order of population by geocode. Hellgate HS would have 900 and Sentinel would have the most.

Lisa Hendrix: if you are able to build the report in Q, you mentioned using the data of middle school F&R—but she would encourage you to use K-5 data because more families turn in the form at that level and there is less movement. Heather replied that unfortunately she can’t. The only information we have is where they went to middle school.

Julie Robitaille asked if any of the K-8s are schoolwide Title I. Not sure.

Karen: the report from Q—is it whether they came from a school that qualified or is it whether they were qualified for F&R? Heather explained that it will look at all of our current high school students: where were they enrolled for middle school, and their F&R status. Karen: so not whether they went to Lowell, but when they did, were they F&R. Heather added that there is a calculation she will do between the K-8 feeder pattern and current high school enrollees: the question we are answering is if I live in Bonner and I am F&R do I go to Hellgate or do I go to Big Sky? What are the percentages of those students that attend? We know anecdotally that of students who live in the Big Sky area in Grant Creek, a large number choose to go to Hellgate HS. And a large number of those students do not qualify for F&R. Whereas students who live in Bonner and may qualify for F&R, maybe they are more likely to go to Hellgate rather than Big Sky.

Trevor: it is saying Brian goes to Hellgate, we have to find out where he went to middle school, and then Heather says it looks at current F&R meal data, comparing percentages, looking at the percent of students who live in Bonner and choose to go to Big Sky.

Karen: some kids in the Lowell neighborhood do not qualify for F&R.

David Rott said it is hard for him. We all agree that F&R has issues. But his problem with the other one is that it seems way more speculative. It has the unknown quantity that makes him uncomfortable; it seems that we are speculating. We can agree that the hard data may not be accurate, that it is probably on the low side. He is not comfortable with the speculation.

Lisa Hendrix argues that it may not be equal across the board as far as students who don’t turn in F&R. She has been an administrator at Porter and Meadow Hill, and she signed numerous requests to come to her building: the vast majority say they want to come for the student culture. She has been an administrator at Porter and has listened to counselors, who have said to students in poverty/struggling students, “have you considered going to Hellgate, it may be the best fit?”

David Rott said Chief Charlo has 60 students from the Cold Springs area, which would bump his percentage up; he thinks there are those situations at any school. We need to work with the hard data we have, understanding that there are problems with it.

Trevor: we have copies of all the transfer forms. The vast majority of kids choosing to go from Big Sky to Hellgate are going for IB and music. IB has about 11% F&R. It is not a high poverty program. Big Sky getting IB might help level that out in the future. We have the capacity to stop the inflow of students. We have done it at other buildings in other grade levels for a variety of reasons. To throw more data that is speculative muddies the water. He would like if we can to keep it within this committee. When it gets into public meetings, we lose some of the rationalization. We should begin to really work to collect some data from our middle schools. There are FERPA issues, but there must be some way to capture a snippet, or to survey kids, asking have you ever been on F&R—a way to gather more data.

Abby Green, math teacher: maybe we need to work on how to get more people to fill it out so we have more accurate numbers.

Tracy Ledyard: it is so hard at the high school level; she works there. At some point the social worker in her says she doesn’t want to have to continue to shake the tree and say “I know you don’t make a lot of money.” She has a problem with making somebody have to do that. That is why she feels so strongly that we all serve these students. Then it becomes personal. So no Hellgate students now get an influx of money to help with interventions? It is tough to talk with people – all we all want to do is help our kids succeed. Having had Title funds at Hellgate for over 30 years, it is devastating to think what it will look like if it is not there.

Julie Robitaille: do you think it would cause an influx of students to go to Big Sky if Hellgate were to lose Title? Brian Fortmann: those kids are the ones who are less likely to be able to make that choice, less likely to have the transportation. That is not the majority of our roaming population.

**Written Reflection** – Committee Members

How do we come up w the most accurate numbers?  
Heather: we have had some good conversation. She thinks it is still a difficult decision. She will ask the committee for written reflection.

Questions for the written reflection: What do you think is the most accurate way to measure poverty in MCPS schools? Why? What supports your viewpoint?

**Closing and next steps**

Next steps: Heather said we need to get this information back out to the Title I meeting of practitioners group. She is thinking, because it is a big group, about sending out the minutes from this meeting along with the written reflection responses, sending it out to principals and the meeting of practitioners group, and asking you to come up with written reflections also. We have the video—maybe they could watch the presentation portion of the video. It would be good if we could get that back by May 15 when building plans/budgets are due. We have another Title I Advisory Committee meeting on May 21, from 6-7:30, and we can discuss reflections from this meeting and from the team of practitioners meeting.

Tracy Ledyard asked when the new data would be available. Heather: if she can get that, it can be part of this. She has a feeling we need some reflection on the straight feeder pattern (purple sheet) and the F&R. She does not think she will get the other data in time to get feedback, but we will have it for the May 21 meeting. The concern is that it will take some time to create some level of accuracy with that new data because it does not align nicely.

Julie Robitaille asked how do we decide between the two if there may be other data?

Rott: that becomes a reflection of what we think in this time that might change if this other data comes in and supports it. There was agreement from the majority of committee members that they did not want to express a preference in methods on the written reflection now, before the additional data is available.

Heather: okay, we will try to have another meeting with this group. B.J. mentioned concerns about the straight K-8 feeder pattern because of open enrollment. She thinks if we go down the feeder pattern model, we will have to have revised data.

Bessette—is it not a confidentiality issue? No, Heather said, because she will be the one looking at it.

Tracy Ledyard: is census data also an option? Is it hard to get? Heather: census data identifies the number who live in the Bonner area who are living in poverty, but not where they choose to go to school.

Quinlan: so we are meeting again before the 21st? Yes; if Heather can get the data. She would like to move this along, due to master schedules, student schedules, etc. Heather will hang on to the reflections. Thanks to Janet Hegedus and to Matt Quinlan for the presentations.

The meeting concluded at 7:28 pm.

Next meeting date: ***May 21, 2014, 6:00 to 7:30 PM, Admin Bldg. Rm 24***

As recording secretary for this meeting, I certify these minutes to be a true and correct copy of what was taken at the meeting.

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

Elizabeth Serviss, Minutes Recorder

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

Heather Davis Schmidt, Executive Regional Director